Sectt. II-27—23,006—24-12-32.

L.S.G (1934) Department.

Ms SERIES.

G.O. No. 439 P.H.

DATED 23.2.1934.

[Despatch Abstract.]

Village Development Fund - South Kanara District - Construction of a latrine and a culvert - Contribution to Uppinangady Panchayat Board - Not admissible.

Advance Copy

C.F. 30.

G.O.Ms.No.754/33

DEPARTMENT. E)

LOCAL SELF - GOVERNMENT -

Received ..... 19 . Registered 19

52599

Subject.

VILLAGE DEVELOPMENT FUND - South Kanara District - Contribution sought by the Uppinangady Panchayat Board - declined - Appeal - submitted to Government.

****

L&C (Cot) Dept.

The receipt of the original submitted as per ltr dt 7/2/33 from the Collector of South Kanara may be awaited

dtd 10/2/33.

ENCLOSURES.

No. .....

.....

Spare copies .....

No. 4/L&C/33

Station Uppinangady; Dated the 22nd December 19 33

From (Name) M.R.Ry. U.Govinda Keshawa Bhat, Avergal.,

(Designation) PRESIDENT;

Uppinangady Panchayat Board, S.Kanara.

To The Secretary to the Government of Madras,

Department.

LOCAL SELF GOVERNMENT -

Fort Saint George, Madras.

Sir, Through, The President, Taluk Board, Puttur, &;

The Inspector of Local Boards, Madras.

I have the honour to append herewith extracts from Panchayat Resolution No 70 dated 30-11-1933 and I have to state as follows:-

2. As repeatedly pressed by the Health Department a pucca latrine and a culvert was constructed at a cost of Rs 134/- and 81/ respectively. As was the practice and understanding the Panchayat resolved to apply to the Village Development Fund Committee for half grant. Our application was rejected saying that under existing orders of Government that no contribution could be given to Panchayats. Hence this humble appeal to Government.

3. The Uppinangady Panchayat is a minor Panchayat whose

normal receipts and expenditure data as follows:-

RECEIPTS.		CHARGES.	
Pro.tax.	Rs 120/-.	Scavanger.	Rs 120/-.
License fees. ..	25/-.	Collection & Office establishment. ..	30/-.
Land cess.	30/-.	Contingencies. ..	25/-.

4. Uppinangady is a small ~~town~~ triangular town having a population of 2,271 where two rivers Netravethi and Kumardhari meet together. Some 5o years ago Uppinangady was the Taluk Head-quarters and very recently the name of this Taluk was -- changed as Puttur Taluk. Uppinangady is a more congested - small town between two rivers and there is no vacant places to answer the natures call. Hence it necessitated the Panch. to construct the latrine without obtaining previous sanction of the Village Development Fund Committee. The culvert ---- constructed lies also in the heart of the town where much - nuisance was being caused to the general public especially during monsoon months.

5. Now coming to the point whether helping panchayats is a legitimate duty of the Village Development Fund Committee or not, I beg to state that the main object in formation of the Village Development Fund Committee is in regard to the - development of rural villages. The fund thus constituted is purely meant for developing the amenities especially in Panch. areas. Sec.114 A(4) of the Act it is laid down that the Village Developmen-t Fund is to be administered chiefly for (1) the development of village communications; (2) the provision of water supply and (3) the promotion of sanitation and public health. The culvert constructed falls under class 1 and the latrine under class 3 above.

6. The Government Order referred to by the Village Development Fund Committee has not been communicated to us. The - Village Development Fund Committee is not justified in rejecting our reasonable application for aid. Till recently I understand the Committee used to help the Panchayats in such cases. We have completed the work 5 or 6 months back and the G.O. -- referred to by the Committee is of recent date. Under the - circumstances, it will be too hard to reject our application

on some minor grounds when our general resources does not permit of any extraordinary expenditure of the kind.

7. I have therefore the honour to request that Government may be graciously pleased to to instruct the Village Development Fund Committee to admit our reasonable claim for half grant for the above said two works.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient Servant.

U K Bhat 25/12

President,
Uppinangady Panchayat Board.
South Kanara Dt.

Extract from the Proceedings of the meeting of the Uppinangady Panchayat Board dated 30-11-'33.

Present:- M. R. Ry U. G. K. Bhat Avl President
" B. Venkappa Rai "
" P. Venkappa Shetty "
" U. Narayana Kini "

Read the following:-

× × ×

No 70/33-34

District Board Presidents endorsement No. Dis 5069/33 dated nil refusing 1/4 grant sought from the Village development fund for the construction of a latrine and culvert at a cost of Rs 134/ and 81/- respectively as valued by the Engineering department.

Resolution

Government will be addressed.

× × ×

U K Bhat 23/12

President,
Panch. Bd. Uppinangady

Bhat 22/12/33.

C.F. 30.

LOCAL SELF - GOVERNMENT - **DEPARTMENT.** 18

OR No. 153/33

Received 1-FEB 34 03649 *Registered* Cus 3521/33 6319

Pan.

Subject.

VILLAGE DEVELOPMENT FUND - South Kanara District - Contribution sought by the Uppinangady Panchayat Board - declined - Appeal - submitted to Government.

****

TALUK BOARD OFFICE PUTTUR SOUTH KANARA RECEIVED. DEC 29 1933

No.

Spare copies

No.

Station Uppinangady; *Dated the* 22nd December 1933.

From (Name) M.R.Ry. U.Govinda Keshawa Bhat, Avergal.,
PRESIDENT;
(Designation) Uppinangady Panchayat Board, S.Kanara.

To The Secretary to the Government of Madras,

Through, LOCAL SELF GOVERNMENT - Department.
Fort Saint George, Madras.
The President, Taluk Board, Puttur, &;
The Inspector of Local Boards, Madras.

Sir,

I have the honour to append herewith extracts from Panchayat Resolution No [redacted] 70 dated 30-11-1933 and I have to state as follows:- page 1 cupa

2. As repeatedly pressed by the Health Department a pucca latrine and a culvert were constructed at a cost of Rs 134/- and 81/ respectively. As was the practice and understanding the Panchayat resolved to apply to the Village Development Fund Committee for half grant. Our application was rejected saying that under existing orders of Government that no contribution could be given to Panchayats. Hence this humble appeal to Government.

3. The Uppinangady Panchayat is a minor Panchayat whose

normal receipts and expenditure are as follows:-

RECEIPTS.		CHARGES.	
Pro.tax.	Rs 120/-.	Scavanger.	Rs 120/-.
License fees. ..	25/-.	Collection & Office establishment. ..	30/-.
Land cess.	30/-.	Contingencies. ..	25/-.

4. Uppinangady is a small ~~town~~ triangular town having a population of 2,271 where two rivers Netravethi and Kumardhari meet together. Some 5o years ago Uppinangady was the Taluk Head-quarters and very recently the name of this Taluk was -- changed as Puttur Taluk. Uppinangady is a more congested - small town between two rivers and there is no vacant places to answer the natures call. Hence it necessitated the Panch. to construct the latrine without obtaining previous sanction of the Village Development Fund Committee. The culvert ---- constructed lies also in the heart of the town where much - nuisance was being caused to the general public especially during monsoon months.

5. Now coming to the point whether helping panchayats is a legitimate duty of the Village Development Fund Committee or not, I beg to state that the main object in formation of the Village Development Fund Committee is in regard to the - development of rural villages. The fund thus constituted is purely meant for developing the amenities especially in Panch. areas. Sec.114 A(4) of the Act it is laid down that the Village Developmen-t Fund is to be administered chiefly for (1) the development of village communications; (2) the provision of water supply and (3) the promotion of sanitation and public health. The culvert constructed falls under class 1 and the latrine under class 3 above.

6. The Government Order referred to by the Village Development Fund Committee has not been communicated to us. The - Village Development Fund Committee is not justified in rejecting our reasonable application for aid. Till recently I understand the Committee used to help the Panchayats in such cases. We have completed the work 5 or 6 months back and the G.O. -- referred to by the Committee is of recent date. Under the - circumstances, it will be too hard to reject our application

on some minor grounds when our general resources does not permit of any extraordinary expenditure of the kind.

7. I have therefore the honour to request that Government may be graciously pleased to to instruct the Village Development Fund Committee to admit our reasonable claim for half grant for the above said two works.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient Servant.

25/12

President,
Uppinangady Panchayat Board.
South Kanara Dt.

Esetract from the Proceedings of the meeting of the Uppinangady Panchayat Board dated 30th November 1933.

Present:- M. R. Ry, U. G. R. Bhat Avl President.
" B. Venkappa Rai "
" P. Venkappa Shetty "
" U. Narayana Kini "

TALUK BOARD OFFICE RECEIVED. DEC 29 1933 PUTTUR. SOUTH KANARA.

Read the following:-

No 70/33-34

District Board Presidents endorsement No. Dis 5069/33 dated nil refusing 1/4 grant sought from the village development fund for the construction of a latrine and culvert at a cost of Rs 134/ and 81/- respectively as valued by the Engineering department

Resolution

Government will be addressed.

× × ×

Bhat 22/12/33

25/12
President.
Panch. Bd. Uppinangady

N. Dis 3521
Feb '33.

Submitted through the President
District Board, South Kanara.

31/12
President,
Puttur Taluk Board

27/12

LB 14/2 6761



F. Dis 158 D.B.34/ A 2.

Endorsement by M. R. Ry A.B.Shetty Avargal,

M.L.C.President,District Board, South Kanara.

Submitted.

Mangalore, 30.1.1934.

President,District Board,

South Kanara.

T.A.S.24.1.34.
Compd.

Office of the Deputy
Dis 3649.34. Rd 2.34

Forwarded

Inspector of Local Boards

To

L&C (Cal) Deptt

CWO 6261 from the DPB. Uppiliangady
d 52599 Memo dy 22/2/33
Endorsement of the Shanara PWD No
1582 dt 34/32 dy 30/34

Cleared 28/2

54/22-2

Shanara - Construction of a latrine and a culvert - Contribution to Uppiliangady PWD - not admissible

Order(s) 439/23.2.34.

The DPB Uppiliangady is informed that the action of the Asst Shanara in having refused to pay the Contribution to it from the Shanara for the Construction of a latrine and a culvert is regular as under the existing provisions of the M.C.B. but no contribution is admissible from the Shanara even for purposes for which the Fund can be utilized. The Govt are therefore unable to interfere in the matter.

Dpd. by Van / Post / Messenger
Dpr.'s initials.
Date 24 · 2 1934

To

The DPB Uppiliangady / thro the Asst Shanara

15/2